## REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 4, 2007, the Examiner: (1) renumbered misnumbered claims 6-20 to 5-19; (2) objected to drawings; (3) objected to specifications; (4) rejected claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,976,254 ("Kramskoy"); (5) rejected claim 12 as allegedly obvious over Kramskoy; (6) rejected claims 3, 4, 5, and 15 as allegedly obvious over Kramskoy in view of U.S. patent No. 5,210,828 ("Bolan"); (7); rejected claims 6 and 16 as allegedly obvious over Kramskoy in view of U.S. patent No. 6,260,131 ("Kikuta"); (8) rejected claims 7-10 an 17 as allegedly obvious over Kramskoy, Kikuta further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,317, 710 ("Ara"); and (6) rejected claims 11 and 18 as allegedly obvious over Kramskoy in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,137,121 ("Gorgone").

With this Response, Applicants renumber claims 6-20 as 5-19, amend claims 1, 3-8 and 10-12, and present new claims 20-26. Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request reconsideration.

### I.    OBJECTIONS TO DRAWINGS

Applicants amend paragraph [0042] of the specification to provide support for reference No. 415 in Figure 6. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

### II.    AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATIONS

Applicants amend specification paragraph [0001] to include serial numbers of various referenced pending applications.

Applicants also amend specification paragraph [0032] and [0042] to correct minor grammatical errors and reference numbers to figures. No new matter has been added.

### III.    ART BASED REJECTIONS

#### A.    Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kramskoy. Applicant amends claim 1 to ensure that the claim falls within only one statutory class, and not to define over any cited art.

Kramskoy is directed towards inter-method control transfers for execution engines with memory constraints. (Kramskoy Title). In particular, Kramskoy teaches a Java computer environment including a virtual machine executing bytecodes of a Java application. (Kramskoy Col. 4, lines 41-45). Specifically, Kramskoy appears to disclose that the bytecodes are executed

by a virtual machine. (Kramskoy Col. 4, lines 43-46). Further, Kramskoy teaches that the virtual machine can be executed only in software or a combination of software and hardware (i.e. using a hardware accelerator). (Kramskoy Col. 2, lines 5-10).

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites "**a middle layer software running on the first processor** and that distributes tasks to run on either or both processors." Applicants submit that Kramskoy does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. In particular, Kramskoy teaches that the virtual machine is executed by a hardware accelerator; thus, failing to teach that the virtual machine ("middle layer software") running only on the first processor. Thus, the applicants submit that Kramskoy teaches the middle layer software running on both the processors and fails to expressly or inherently teach "**a middle layer software running on the first processor** and that distributes tasks to run on either or both processors."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Kramskoy, and none of the other art of record satisfy the deficiencies of Kramskoy. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims which depend on claim 1 (claims 2-12) should be allowed. Applicants amend claims 6-13 in order to renumber them as 5-12, and not to define over prior art. Further, Applicants amend dependent claims 3-8 and 10-12 to ensure they fall within only one statutory class, and not to define over any prior art.

### B.    Claim 13 (Previously Number 14)

Claim 13 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kramskoy. Applicants amend claim 14 in order to renumber it as claim 13, and not to define over prior art.

Claim 13, by contrast, specifically recites "distributing tasks to each of the plurality of processors by **middle layer software running on the processor on which the operating system executes**." Applicants submit that Kramskoy does not expressly or inherently teach such a method. In particular, Kramskoy teaches that the virtual machine is executed by a hardware accelerator; thus, failing to teach that the virtual machine ("middle layer software") running only on the first processor. Thus, the applicants submit that Kramskoy teaches the middle layer software running on both the processors and fails to expressly or inherently teach "distributing tasks to each of the plurality of processors by **middle layer software running on the processor on which the operating system executes**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over Kramskoy, and none of the other art of record satisfy the deficiencies of Kramskoy.

Accordingly, claim 13 and all claims which depend on claim 13 (claims 14-19) should be allowed. Applicants amend claims 15-20 in order to renumber them as 14-19, and not to define over prior art.

## IV.    NEW CLAIMS

With this Response, Applicants present new claims 20-26.   Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 20-26 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited art.

## V.    CONCLUSION

In course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Utpal D. Shah/

Utpal D. Shah
PTO Reg. No. 60,047
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 391-1900 (Phone)
(512) 320-9182 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS